HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

VOL. XIV

JUNE 1958

THE MINISTER'S QUARTERLY

THE EDITOR'S PAGE 1

FATHERS AND BRETHREN
—a message from our new Associate Minister 2

THE MINISTER AND THE PARISH
Architecture and the Vocation of the Church
—Stephen R. Chamberlain 3
Meditation for Ministers—Roy Pearson 9
A Preacher's Prayer—Wallace Cedarleaf 11
The Minister's Responsibility in Music
—Barbara J. Owen 12

THE MINISTER AND THEOLOGY
Faith and Education—Gordon Michelson 14
On Coming to the Lord's Table
—Charles A. Baldwin 21
On Listening to Gerald Heard
—Joseph F. King 25

THE MINISTER AND THE WORLD CHURCH
World Congregationalism at Hartford
—Russell Henry Stafford 27
Ecumenicity and Missions—Hugh Vernon White 29

THE MINISTER AND THE DENOMINATION
Christian Leadership on Mission Fields
—David M. Stowe 31
Jonathan Edwards in 1958—Charles T. Brown 34

THE MINISTER AND HIS READING
Recommended Reading List
—by the Associates in Reading 36

Issued In the Interest of The Parish Ministry

Editor
WILLIAM COOLIDGE HART

Associate Editors
WILLIAM L. BRADLEY
RICHARD P. CARTER
ARTHUR P. COLBOURN
CHARLES L. COPENHAVER
LAWRENCE L. DURGIN
NATHANAEL M. GUPTILL
ARNOLD M. KENSETH

Corresponding Editors
B. KENNETH ANTHONY
BEN BRADFORD
GEORGE E. BURTON
DAVID G. COLWELL
ROBERT C. YOH

Assistant to the Editor
SYLVIA W. FORD

VOL. XIV

THE MINISTER'S QUARTERLY

Published quarterly in the interest of the Parish Ministry by
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE MINISTRY OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

Communications relating to subscriptions should be addressed to the office of The General Council, Room 915, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. Unsolicited manuscripts and letters should be addressed to the Editor, 27 East St., Pittsfield, Massachusetts.

Single copy 25 cents. Annual Subscription One Dollar.

Re-entered as second class matter December 9, 1955 at the Post Office at Pittsfield, Mass., under act of March 3, 1879

Printed by THE SUN PRINTING CORPORATION, Pittsfield, Massachusetts

the editor's page

Our New Associate Minister

The appointment of a new Associate Minister and Secretary of the General Council is a matter of moment to everyone concerned for the welfare of Congregationalism, but it is of special significance for its Ministry. For chief among his responsibilities is the direction of the work of the Department of the Ministry, a department whose work under the leadership first of Fred L. Fagley and latterly of Fred S. Buschmeyer has had an increasingly important impact upon our whole denominational life.

Those who know the Rev. Nathanael M. Guptill, who recently began his work in that capacity, will bear ready witness that he is just the sort of man who should be our Associate Minister. Men in parishes large and small will find in him a sincere and sympathetic friend. He is steeped in the Congregational tradition. He is devoted to its principles. He is a good team-player, and our Minister, Fred Hoskins, will find in him the best possible helpmate.

We are tempted to say more. But lest this degenerate into a premature eulogy, we would simply add that in his appointment, Congregational stock has gone up several points. We prophesy for him the increasing love and respect of the ministers of our fellowship.

Mr. Guptill was born in 1917 in a Congregational parsonage in Deer Isle, Maine. He graduated from Colby College in 1939 and Andover Newton Theological School in 1943. He has held pastorates in Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts, and comes to his present position from Newton, Mass., where he was pastor of the First Congregational Church and on the Andover Newton faculty.

We have invited him to use the medium of The Quarterly to say a word to us. Please see page 2 of this issue.

The Quarterly Departments

Readers of The Quarterly may sometimes wonder at the appropriateness of assigning certain articles to a given department of our magazine. Mr. Stowe's article on "Christian Leadership on Mission Fields," for example, might as well be published under "The Minister and the World Church," as under "The Minister and the Denomination," and Dr. Stafford's article, vice versa.

Our departments are, of course, principally an editorial device and the allocation of an article is necessarily somewhat arbitrary. Sometimes it is determined by its origin: the editor who procured it, the man who wrote it. (Mr. Stowe, as Educational Secretary for the American Board, is a denominational official.) Sometimes, the editor furrows his brow a bit to determine where an article can be most appropriately placed. The fact is, of course, that ministerial concerns and interests cannot be easily departmentalized. They all impinge upon one another.

An Invitation to Write

This issue contains articles on such a variety of subjects: church architecture, music, missions, education, Gerald Heard and Jonathan Edwards; that we believe it presents rather impressive evidence of the breadth of ministerial interests, and may inspire other embryonic writers in our fellowship to share their special interest with their colleagues. We cannot, of course, publish everything we receive, but we urge you to try your hand at writing as, at least, a good intellectual discipline. From the editor's viewpoint, (all other things being equal), careful and imaginative writing will always give your article the advantage.

Fathers and Brethren:

I am grateful to the editor of The Minister's Quarterly for this chance to extend greetings to the finest fraternity I know, the pastors of our churches.

There is a true saying in our fellowship, "There is no promotion from the parish ministry." Never is one more aware of this than when he is embarking on a work like mine. You drive up to the filling station and the attendant says, "Hi, Reverend! I hear you're leaving us. What's your new job?"

Now, if you can say, "I'm going to be the Pastor of the First Church in Newton," he knows immediately what you mean and there's an end to it. But what can I say? I can tell him the truth to wit: "I have been elected Associate Minister and Secretary and Director of the Department of the Ministry of the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches in the U.S.A., and Co-Secretary of the General Synod of the United Church of Christ." For want of a better reply, I've tried this. It has a general effect like that which would result from reading him a portion from Form 1040 of the scriptures of the Internal Revenue Service. He says, "Is that good?" and I reply, "I think so," leaving us both about as confused as we were in the first place.

But after much experimenting I have found a reply to this query which works—at least with informed Congregational Christians. It is this: "I am to be Fred Buschmeyer's successor." This, people understand. Here is a name respected and beloved which indicates not a position but a person. Therefore, I identify myself to you in this way.

I am not "taking Fred Buschmeyer's place." Nobody can do that, and thank God he is nearby for help and counsel still. I am setting out to continue his ministry as the Lord shall enable me, so that someday when somebody recites my long title and asks "What does that mean?" he can be told "That is what Nat Guptill does," and it will mean something good.

Neither the two Freds who have preceded me nor the Fred who is my chief and my colleague regarded the acceptance of election to the general ministry of the Fellowship as any abdication of the pastoral office. Like them, I aspire to make the conduct of my new duties a pastoral ministry. This will depend upon my faithfulness, upon your helpfulness, and upon the providence of the heavenly Father.

There is an uneasy time at the beginning of any new pastorate somewhat like the anxious days after a vaccination when it either "takes" or "doesn't take." In this time some in the congregation will say, "Jesus we know and Paul we know and Fred we know, but who are you?" I ask your patience in these days and your prayers that our life and labor together may be such as to up-build the Church of God and strengthen the ministry of Christ.

"May the Lord do what seems good to Him!"

Fraternally yours,

Nathanael M. Guptill

THE MINISTER AND THE PARISH

Dept. Editor:
CHARLES L. COPENHAVER, Oneonta Congregational Church, So. Pasadena, Calif.

"Architecture which best serves the Church will focus on this question above all others: how a congregation, within a living tradition and as part of a universal communion, conceives its destiny as a people in the sight of God," says the author of the following article.

ARCHITECTURE AND THE VOCATION OF THE CHURCH

by STEPHEN R. CHAMBERLAIN*

CURRENT EXPECTATIONS place the number of American churches needed in the next decade to 70,000. We can only imagine the vast sums of money to be expended in this effort to satisfy our religious needs.

While we all hope our financial resources will be wisely budgeted in these projects let us also pray that economy of thought be not considered an advantage. The record does not give such a hopeful prospect. In the post-war religious boom American Protestants have shown their liberality in underwriting building programs, but they have not often shown equal expenditures of theological and intellectual perception.

Herein follows an invitation to all to invest rewarding mental effort in church architecture. We will have no finer buildings in the generation to come than we, as ministers and laymen, are willing to warrant by our open-mindedness and thoughtful understanding.

The correlation of our thoughts in this area will produce controversy. No one has sat through a congregational meeting at which preliminary plans were presented without sampling disagreement and dissension. However, any intelligent person is aware that the discussion of church architecture is not to be resolved in the easy fashion of those who choose the path paved with the least controversy. Something we need desperately to learn in our parish philosophy is that controversy is not necessarily un-Christian behavior. What *is* less than worthy of Christians are the half-measures that suggest that issues that provoke heat should be avoided. Here is a point we can carry all the way down the line of the Church's concerns—from missions to Christian education philosophy to social action—to any area of controversy among Christians. It does not reflect credit on church people to throw away every hot potato. What does show the mettle of a Christian congregation is its ability to comprehend discussion, debate, even argument, within the bonds of Christian love and theological clarity.

My main concern in writing is to bring together, from the point of view of a minister, some thoughts that point to deeper implications of a church building program than we normally consider.

What I have to say rests on two premises, and it is these pre-suppositions that I should explain at the start. The first is that the average layman (layman, that is,

*Mr. Chamberlain is minister of the United Church of West Cornwall, Cornwall, Connecticut.

from the point of view of the architectural profession) is a poor judge of values in architecture. The second premise is that the best enterprise for laymen concerned about church architecture is full and frank discussion about the subject.

Our Poor Bases for Judgment

In the first place, laymen—including this writer—have only a poor basis on which to judge good architecture. Why? Because we have been generally exposed to poor example. I speak now as one who was cultivated within the pristine white walls of the New England heartland, who rolled as an infant on the canted floors of a "colonial" farmhouse, who worshipped as a child in a church conceived in the hey-day of Victorian congregationalism. The industrial community in which I grew up favored me with an oppressive sense of the arbitrary taste of the people who pay to erect public buildings. Nothing in the profile of that community's buildings bore any resemblance to what it was intended to be. Banks were modeled after temples; churches were built to resemble medieval fortresses and libraries were fashioned after English baronial homes. My sense of propriety in architecture has been seriously affected by this hodge-podge design to which earliest childhood associations have been attached. And few of us who call ourselves laymen as far as architecture is concerned can claim immunity from this poison of bad example. My first premise, then, is that we laymen, accustomed to the welter of American sentimentalism and plagiarism in building types, are poor judges when it comes to good architecture.

The second premise may sound contradictory to the first. It is that no enterprise is more fruitful for churchmen, laymen as far as architecture is concerned, than full and frank discussion of a subject about which we know so little. Why is this true?

Firstly, because architecture is one of the concerns that people generally are talking about, and Christians had better be keen about the subjects that are winning an audience. Christianity is an exciting religion. The facets of Christian thought rub against every area of life that really matters to people. Especially with those concerns that have to do with cultural values, with those qualities that mark us out as civilized beings, with these Christians ought to be interested, conversant and informed, or what we glibly call "Christian Civilization" can be written off the books.

And secondly, particularly for those of us who face more practical programs of church building, discussion of architecture can aid our understanding of ourselves, which is part of Christian growth. St. Augustine was a great Christian, and to prove it literate people point to his monumental *Confessions*. For a man to command respect of his fellow Christians requires that he be knowledgeable about himself, that he know something about what makes him tick, how he forms his opinions, how he apprehends values, and so forth.

A most valuable process in learning who we are as individuals is to ask ourselves searchingly *why* we accept certain things as true without analysis, *why* we presume to possess competence we don't have, and, more important, how we can become free of these prejudices. A good way to uncover these problem areas is to select a subject intensely important to us, especially one on which we allow little room for debate. Great possibilities of growth lie ahead of Christians who accept the discipline of trying to understand themselves in reference to questions that give them the greatest difficulty. To some of us, emotionally speaking, architecture of our church is in this category.

But a more important reason adheres to this second premise: that discussion of architecture is important for Christians. Such discussion, especially when it brings together a congregation to plan a home for itself, involves the most serious con-

sideration of who that congregation is, what constitutes them as a people and their common vocation as a church of Christ. At this moment of history there is no more important question than that of our identity as a people. Conflicting social and political philosophies are tearing our world asunder, and before it is too late Christians must discover what others claim to know as absolute truth—what is the nature of a community. Specifically, as the Church, we must fathom that which really unites us, which makes us a people of God.

Two Basic Premises

Thus we set down two basic premises of the discussion to follow: one, that the average American is a poor judge of architecture, and, two, that nothing is more important for us and our world than honest discussion of this controverted subject. It may be clearer now that what is concerned in this discussion is not "taste". The issues run deeper to theology, to social and cultural perspectives, and to insights into our thinking and personalities.

Let us unburden this discussion of superficialities. Fundamentally we are most concerned to know our vocation as a particular people, as the Church, as the Christian community. This is what religious architecture, as all other symbolic arts the Church practises or patronizes, are concerned to express: the nature of our life as a fellowship.

No more earnest search preoccupied persons in the biblical history than this quest of a religious people to know what constituted them as a community. The Old Testament declared that the people of Israel existed because of a Covenant, a sacred relationship with the God of history and creation. The most grievous sins, in the minds of the prophets, stemmed from efforts to forget the Covenant and its requirements of righteousness and love. Then, through the balance of that history up to the New Testament, a tapering process set in until, of all who acknowledged the Covenant, only one stood forth to fulfill it, Jesus of Nazareth. His death abrogated the lapsed community. The racial pretension, the arrogance of blood and caste, the refinements of "Jewish" and "Non-Jewish" which devolved from neglect of the Covenant were cast upon the ash heap of proud and wasted cultures. And a new people emerged, the bearers of the Gospel, a community implicated in the sins of the old nation, yet conscious of God's forgiveness and bound in a fellowship of mercy and love. Such retelling is a skeletal shadow of the whole story, but the outline serves to remind us who read the Bible only in snatches that throughout its books runs one glorious theme: the identity of the people of God and their vocation as a Church.

Now phrase this theme as a question before a congregation today: Who are we as a church? What is our vocation and destiny as a people?

Consider the most practical answer first. We are a social group. We come together as a collection of people concerned to know one another. We interact with each other in particular ways that make us different from any other group. Therefore we can run through a whole list of characteristics that mark us as a unique social group, distinctive from all others.

Our Orientation

But we must also define ourselves as a religious group. That is, we share certain beliefs. We have a significant history of worshiping together and of experiencing a unique form of ritual. We are oriented around special events that form a correlated religious memory. We have been united in a common religious program reflecting mutual ideals and aspirations.

However, another statement must be added; for we are also a Christian group. That means that throughout our social and religious experience together a spirit allied with the Risen Christ somehow interweaves all the other uniting bonds. We are a supernatural society, in that when geography and even beliefs cease to hold us together, a deeper linkage still binds

us one with the other. In fact, these transcendent fetters form a huge constellation, far greater than a local congregation. Because we are a Christian group we are woven into the fabric of a community that includes everyone who, in any nation, has ever experienced the power of the Risen Christ. Our communion crosses national boundaries and all separations of race; it spans continents and centuries. As a Christian group we belong to one people whose beginnings are dimly seen in the persons of Abraham and Moses, and whose present extension reaches around the globe. At this level it becomes less and less important that we exist as a social or religious group. The determinative factor that makes us a Christian people is the common destiny that is set for us by the simple fact that we are a Church, which means (literally) that "we belong to the Lord". The essential question with which we began, "who are we as a community", can now be seen to concern our vocation, our purpose and our mission as this Christian group known as the Church of Jesus Christ.

Some will ask at this point: what has all this to do with architecture? The answer is simple. There is a natural confluence of architectural expression and the conception that a congregation has of its own identity. The design of a church, if it is to be true, will symbolically reflect the self-image of the people who worship in it.

Defining a Congregation

Consider again the three ways of defining a congregation. We said first that it is a social group. It is made up of people who interact with each other, who, at least at stated times, share the same geographical area. By itself this definition produces a certain architectural expression. A church which houses a certain social group will look, as many churches do, as though it was designed to answer one primary question: What do we see when we look at ourselves? The architecture will "say": this people is mainly interested in introspection. Their concern is mainly at the level of their own interaction, with the display of those factors that make them conscious of being a social group. It is obviously those churches that proclaim a certain caste of wealth, or socially affected predelictions of "style" that belong in this category.

But we spoke also of a congregation as a religious group, as an organization having stated beliefs, cultic practices and common memories that distinguish it. Again, a particular architectural expression suits this definition. Here will be found churches designed to answer the primary question: What do we see when we look at ourselves through the eyes of outsiders? What gives us distinction as a religious organization? What identifies us to those not of our numbers as a particular religious group? Again, we will think of certain buildings that have been admirably created to convey these special concerns.

We spoke also of a congregation as a Christian group, as those "belonging to the Lord". In this case the question to which architecture will address itself is not how the group looks in its own eyes, nor how it looks in the eyes of others but rather, how it sees itself in the perspective of the Lord who inspires and governs its life. Architecture which best serves the Church will focus on this question above all others: how a congregation, within a living tradition and as part of a universal communion, conceives its destiny as a people in the sight of God.

Naturally, the other definitions of a church are not absent in any architecture. The evident costliness of a building will inevitably say something about the Church as a social group, and the organized beliefs and practices of a religious group will bear an influence on the house that encloses a congregation. But dominant in the design of a Christian church where the congregation seriously considers its

common vocation will be written answers to the question: How is this people beheld by its Lord?

Mistakes in Architecture

It must be evident, then, that the major responsibility for mistakes in church architecture rests not so much with miscreant architects as with unthinking congregations. The result of an inept and expressionless building comes from failure of a Christian group to understand and demonstrate its true identity and vocation as a people. Where so little theological thought is expended, as on this very point among most congregations, "mistakes" are to be expected.

You will readily see how such failures of understanding are possible. A congregation may lack the courage of confronting its own confession and will settle for a compromise in the doubtful area of "taste". Another congregation will have allowed control of its policies to fall into the hands of a vested interest, with the result that effective questioning of the common identity of the whole group is stifled. Other churches will have consented to such rigid ecclesiastical tradition that the question can enter only as an impertinent intrusion. The struggle to arrive at appropriate architectural expression is hampered by the same temptations to apathy, self-satisfaction and cowardice as are all the other important adventures of the Church.

Now there are at least two related questions that deserve further treatment, arising from what has been written above. They are related concerns that frequently emerge when a church contemplates a building program. They center on the meaning of tradition, first as a deposit from the past, and secondly as a projection into the future.

The Place of Tradition

How does tradition enter the dimension of church architecture? We have accepted as our first premise that the average layman is ill-tutored in judgment of taste in architecture. His usual reflections on the subject betray superficial and often sentimental attachments to hallowed example out of his past experiences. But he will often clothe his predelictions by reference to a vague factor known as "tradition".

What tradition may legitimately be brought to bear on this discussion? It will be natural, and, within limits, proper, for denominational tradition to enter the picture. But beyond this primary ecclesiastical inference there are actually no arbitrary taste-judgments which may be insinuated under the stultifying title of "tradition."

Let us put this same caveat in positive terms. There *is* a tradition of the Christian Church that will have relevance to the church building of any generation. It is the living tradition, the matrix, of which each congregation is born and is sustained in existence. This tradition is the constant impression upon a worshiping congregation of the Word of God. Thus viewed, tradition becomes the unrelenting demand of the present, from which there can be no escape to a nostalgic past or to an apocalyptic future.

Two quotations, one ancient and one modern, may assist us in thinking of tradition. Repentance for disobedience of the Covenant in the past (the forty years' wandering of Israel) led the author of *Hebrews* to exhort his generation to present and instant loyalty: "Today, when you hear his voice do not harden your hearts as in the rebellion". In other words, the "tradition" of the past, embodied in the covenant-relationship of Israel and her God, teaches no greater lesson than that fidelity in the present moment is God's inescapable requirement.

Similarly, Daniel Jenkins, the English congregationalist, emphasizes tradition's thrust into contemporary life when, speaking of worship, he says: "They (the congregation) are able to meet together in that place on that day, only because the faith has been effectively "tradi-

tioned" by those who, in the past, found God faithful. Like Israel in the Promised Land, they are able to argue that they would not be where they are if God were a reality, who had entered into a covenant with their fathers and who continues to honour it with the children. Thus, their whole existence depends on the tradition."

We should expect then to find tradition vitally active in the present life of a congregation, and especially as it plans a home for itself. But it is tradition, not in terms of static forms carried over from the past, but rather as a repossession by the spirit that guided the Church's past.

Tradition, thus understood, imposes upon a modern congregation the demand of constant relevance to the culture in which it lives. The tradition of the Church, as it has attained noblest expression, is seen in Christian individuals and movements which have most honestly and courageously sought forms within their culture for the expression of the Gospel. A few names which represent high-water marks of Christian influence will suffice as evidence: Augustine and Calvin in theology and social philosophy, Durer and Bach in the arts, Aquinas and Erasmus in scholarship. The tradition to which relationship must be established is the spiritual drive which has recurrently sent the Church to the frontiers of culture, not the forms that gave the spirit outward expression.

Certainly our congregational tradition deserves to be honored by more than antiquarian reverence for colonial forms. Our tradition comprises the dynamic movement of people and thought to embrace new continents. The tradition is the generative principle of the Word of God, unleased from ecclesiastical bondage to do its work among a congregated people. The tradition is that of evangelical freedom seeking institutional form under the vision of a practical theocracy. To submit the tradition to the narrow dicta of Congregational "traditionalism" is not only an historical offense; it is also a subversion of the rationale of the movement itself.

The second part of this question of tradition concerns, not the past, but the future. There are those who doubt that a valid heritage is being prepared for future generations by the erection of "modernistic" church buildings. The doubts are earnest and deserve an answer. Basically, we need to ask ourselves, "What do we want to say to our children?" We can tell them on the one hand, that we have really been a lost generation, that we could find no home for ourselves except the housing of a past time. On the other hand we can convey to them a sense of our having discovered, or at least having sought honestly to know, who we really are as a people, as a Christian group, as a church. The best we can prepare for those we love is a forceful expression of what we know ourselves to be in the sight of God.

The Question of Permanence

Here also occurs the question of permanence. What architecture will last, we ask, especially in relation to the greatest public buildings we raise, namely our churches? A serious point is involved for Christians, for it is a matter essentially of our perspective in history. History, says the Christian who looks with understanding at the Cross, is on the side of truth. Dishonesty may prevail within the earthly dimension of history, but an ultimate judgment has been written on the Cross, which sets Christ as the final arbiter of all secrets of men's hearts, and the dispenser of the final word on history. What then is most permanent is what most conforms to the truth. Church architecture, like all other expressions of man's worship and devotion, has no other hope of permanence than in attempting answers to the perennial questions: Who are the people architecture serves as a congregation? And how are these realizations of our identity and vocation translated with the greatest honesty in terms of function, materials and design?

"How many of us have a sense of destiny about men?"

MEDITATION FOR MINISTERS

by ROY PEARSON*

EXACTLY WHAT HAPPENED to Paul immediately after his staggering experience on the road to Damascus we probably shall never fully know, and there are several apparently conflicting accounts of where he went and whom he met and what he did. It is not an unreasonable assumption, however, that Paul himself would be the most reliable reporter of these incidents, and this is his own description of them:

> When he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I did not confer with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia; and again I returned to Damascus.

I wonder if it was Paul the preacher who wrote those words. I wonder if he knew, even as he wrote them, how much they tell not only about himself but also about the will of God for every man and woman on the earth, and for no one more than for Christian ministers.

I.

"When he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace . . ." How many of us really feel like that? How many of us have, deep within the fiber of our beings, the consciousness of cosmic origins, the unquestioning awareness that in the mind of God we were planned before we were born and that on the level of God's purpose we were expected before we arrived? How many of us have a sense of destiny about us, the conviction that the world has a place for us, that God has a need for us, and that somewhere in the vast and seemingly impenetrable mysteries of creation there is yet a voice which speaks directly to our own hearts and pleads with us to occupy the place and fill the need?

There *is* such a voice. Paul was familiar with it. Peter knew it at last. Jesus, supremely, had heard and obeyed. But is this one of the gaps in our own security, commitment, and effectiveness? "Thou art the man," the voice says. "Thou! Only thou! Among all of the bewildering mazes of men's wanderings there is one straight road which none but thee can walk. None but thee!" But have we heard that voice? Have we even believed that it spoke?

II.

"When he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace, **was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles . . ."** Before Paul was born, God had set him apart. Before Paul knew anything at all, God knew, and God planned. Through all the years of his maturing God had hovered round his life—hoping, persuading, calling. But one day on the road to Damascus the crucial hour came, and God revealed his Son to Paul in order that he might preach him among the Gentiles. The Word became flesh. The general was made specific. The timeless spoke in the language of time. "This is the purpose for which you were called,"

*Dr. Pearson is dean of Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Mass.

God was saying to Paul. "I ask you to give your whole life to this one, clear, definite, feasible task. I ask you to preach Christ among the Gentiles."

In the deepest meaning of the words there is no such thing as a common man. In the sight of God every man is uncommon, completely individual, utterly lacking in uniformity with any of his neighbors. Take any man you will, and the record of his relationship with God is not complete when you have said that he was set apart before he was born and that he was called by God's grace; for the record must also embrace some wondrously startling day when God has done or yet will do for him what once he did for Paul, when God says to him with reference to one, specific undertaking, "This is that for which you were given your life," and when all the congregation of the angels holds its breath to see what happens. God does not simply reveal his Son. He always reveals him **in order that—;** and the number of the purpose is always singular, and the recipient of the revelation is always an individual.

III.

"When he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles, **I did not confer with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia . . ."** There are plenty of times when we ought to confer with flesh and blood, when precisely what we need is to go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before us, when our very lives cry out for the insights of other human beings. But this was not one of those times in Paul's own experience. On the road to Damascus his life had suddenly been shaken apart, and there beneath the hot, desert sun he lay disjointed and disorganized. For the first time in his life God was dealing with Paul face to face, and there was a sense in which the business of God with Paul was no one else's business. So Paul went away into Arabia. That is, he went away into silence, into loneliness, into the awesome privacy of a place were he could be with none but God.

Could it be that too many of us build too low a ceiling on our lives, demand security too soon? Could it be that we have put too great priority on being well-adjusted, that getting finally in step with our fellows, we have also gotten out of step with God? Could it be that we have not fully understood what one psychologist was speaking about when he said, "The ability to permit oneself to become disorganized is crucial to the development of a very high level of integration"? And then in those rare moments when we have been brave enough to let God take us apart and show us what our hearts and souls are really like, could it be that we have too frequently conferred with flesh and blood, too often gone up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before us? Could it be that too seldom we have gone away into Arabia, into the lonely silences where no man can speak to us, into the mysterious reaches of prayer where the human soul touches the cosmic soul and being connected again with the sources of its being, finds once more the lost power and meaning and joy?

IV.

But this is not the end of Paul's sentence. "I went away into Arabia,' he said; **"and again I returned to Damascus."** Arabia had its proper purpose for the life which lay ahead of him, even as a flight of stairs had its own essential function; but just as you did not set up housekeeping on a flight of stairs, neither did you settle down to spend all of your days in Arabia. Some day you had to leave the desert. Some day you had to go back to the world of men.

So Paul "returned to Damascus." That was where he had been headed before God stepped out and stopped him. That was where the Christians knew him as

their enemy. That was where his former friends would soon call him a traitor. In all Damascus there was no one who would understand or love or trust him. Damascus was probably the hardest place in the world for Paul to go, but it was also the only place; for in the deepest meaning of the word, Damascus was the world.

The world had not changed while Paul was in Arabia. Damascus was the same old, sin-torn city toward which Paul had been riding when God revealed his Son to him. The world had not changed, but O how Paul had changed! And because Paul had changed, the world would change. Because of those events on the sandy, sun-baked road on the outskirts of the city, because of the happenings in the fearful loneliness of the desert, life would never be the same again for Damascus. Some things would die, but other things would live. And if evil had reason to tremble, righteousness had cause for gratitude, and truth for hope, and love for joy.

"When he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I did not confer with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I want away into Arabia; and again I returned to Damascus."

I wonder if it was Paul the preacher who wrote those words. I wonder if he knew, even as he wrote them, how much they tell not only about himself but also about the will of God for every man and woman on the earth.

A PREACHER'S PRAYER

REMIND ME, GOD, that the Cause for which I work is holier than I.

Keep me from chasing a word through Greece and Israel if it displays my knowledge rather than thy wisdom.

Help me arrive at the mountain top with my people, to see the sun, rather than stand on the pinnacle and cast a scornful shadow to darken their way.

Whenever I leave a church to take up new duties, help me leave it gracefully, but definitely.

Teach me to realize that one hundred preachers just like myself might be a hindrance rather than a help in the spreading of the gospel.

Save me from the ministerial tone, by which some test the sign of spirituality in the inflection of a phrase.

Help me give thanks for my fellow ministers whose unique methods and refreshing manners make mine different, if not original.

I thank thee for choosing me a vessel. Help me interpret rather than interrupt thy living word to a wayward world.

WALLACE CEDARLEAF

A helpful outline for our thoughts about church music

THE MINISTER'S RESPONSIBILITY IN MUSIC

by BARBARA J. OWEN*

WHETHER A GIVEN minister has college credits in musicology, or whether he has never heard a symphony orchestra; whether he can sing arias from oratorios or cannot carry a tune in the proverbial bucket, he has a responsibility towards the music program of his church. The manner and sort of responsibility differs from church to church, but if he at all believes in music as an adjunct to worship, he must acknowledge some responsibility. This responsibility may be complex or quite simple. It is hoped that the following outline be used as a guide and springboard for thought by those concerned with the music in their churches.

The minister is responsible for:

1. *Educating himself musically.* Although an increasing number of seminaries are including music in their curriculum, not all make it compulsory. Even if musical studies of some kind were begun in college, they should not be allowed to end there. Musical education does not necessarily mean a formal classroom education, either. Making a habit of attending concerts, particularly symphonic and choral (and bringing the family) is one of the pleasantest ways of educating oneself in music. Regular concert-going often leads to record-collecting, a good family hobby. Playing a musical instrument or singing in a choral society is found by many to be not only educational, but relaxing as well. And it's never too late to learn!

2. *Choosing hymns for tune as well as text.* Though ephemeral tunes are often wedded to poor texts, as in the case of the happily vanishing so-called "gospel songs", sometimes a good text may be found set to a tasteless or inappropriate tune. Though rare, at least in major denominational hymnals, this situation can be remedied by simply choosing a better tune in the same metre (consult the metrical index of the hymnal), being sure to announce this change to the congregation. If it is a familiar tune, they will follow along with ease. An offense sometimes perpetrated in churches where the choir processes is to choose a processional hymn which has a 3/4 or 6/8 metre. Fortunately, most hymns of praise are in 4/4 or 2/4 time, and the first hymn should always be one of praise.

3. *Seeing that the Sunday school music is up-to-date.* It is unfortunately the practice of too many churches to either relegate old and outdated church hymn books to the Sunday school, or else to purchase cheap commercial gospel-song collections under the highly irrational conception that this is what the children want. The only people who will actually want this type of music are the "old-timers", and they should be allowed to sing it all they want outside of church services. It should however be always borne in mind that children's tastes in music and other realms are by and large blank slates, and that it is the responsibility and duty of the church to see that only the beautiful, uplifting and meaningful be inscribed on those slates, for what the church gives an individual in youth remains with him always. Most of the major denominations print fine collections of Sunday-school music, the Presbyterian and Methodist

*The writer is Minister of Music in the First Congregational Church of Portland, Connecticut.

being perhaps the best. To be sure, a good book may cost a bit more than the cheap collections, but when a church lays out money for its children, it is always an investment, never an expenditure. If a church cannot afford a good or new Sunday-school book, it is better by far to use the regular denominational hymnal with them than to waste money on a tasteless collection.

4. *Encouraging the selection and employment of good leadership.* With church music leadership, there are dangers at both ends of the scale. In the small church it is usually in the form of the poorly-trained "volunteer", who gladly serves without pay, but often uses this as an excuse for laziness and a dictatorial attitude. No matter how small the church, a musician should always receive some regular pay for his services. In a larger church, there is the entirely different danger of wanting to hire a "name", or an instrumental or vocal virtuoso, regardless of whether he is more interested in his own advancement than the work of the church, or whether he is even a good Christian. A church capable of paying a fulltime salary to a musical leader (and many that are capable don't, to their own detriment) also usually has several candidates to choose from, and the minister's counsel is often needed in making the right choice. This of course holds true in smaller churches as well.

5. *Seeing to it that competent advice is asked when needed.* This especially applies to smaller church situations, where a highly-trained church musician is not on the staff. Outside advice from a neutral party should always be sought in purchasing a new organ or doing any major work on an old one. Too many pitfalls lie before a lay committee or a non-professional organist in the way of unscrupulous rebuilders and high-pressure salesmen. These latter are often connected with the manufacturers of electronic instruments, most of which are unsuited to church use. It also is sometimes wise to call in an outsider to help in screening candidates for the position of minister of music, assuming that he does not know the candidates. The best source of help is the nearest full-time, college-trained minister of music, or someone who has majored in organ on a college level. Even if such a person feels he cannot be of help, he can invariably recommend someone who can.

6. *Supporting the minister of music.* If a church is fortunate to have a full-time, well-trained leader, all matters of music should be referred to him, for advice and approval, from who should tune the organ to what new Sunday-school hymnal to buy, and the administration of the music program should be left strictly to this person, with no supervision or interference from the minister. In such a situation, the minister's sole public responsibility is his unwavering support and encouragement. If a minister has questions and criticisms of the music program, they should be reserved for private conferences, which conferences should be held frequently by the minister and minister of music for purposes of program planning and teamwork. If the leader is not full-time or specially-trained, you also owe him your encouragement, especially in matters of self-improvement. There are increasing numbers of opportunities for this in the form of one-day workshops and weekend conferences held under various local and national auspices, as well as summer schools of a week's duration or longer, held by colleges and seminaries. When considered in terms of immediate returns in expanded technique and repertoire, as well as renewed enthusiasm, it is considered worthwhile by many churches to pay all or part of the fees required for their ministers of music to attend such sessions.

THE MINISTER AND THEOLOGY

Dept. Editor: LAWRENCE L. DURGIN, Central Congregational Church, Providence 6, R.I.

The writer of the following provocative article is the minister of the Westfield, New Jersey, Methodist Church, the largest church of that denomination in New Jersey.

FAITH AND EDUCATION

by GORDON MICHELSON

I REMEMBER THE TIME when I thought education should be the exclusive task of the state; that the church should stick to Sunday Schools. My reasoning went like this: the great State University which I attended had no seeming dearth of funds to provide the best in equipment and personnel; it had a variety of courses running the gamut from cartooning to canning, and you could take a pretty fair share of them at any time of the day from 7:50 in the morning until 10:50 at night. Moreover, the tuition was a mere fraction of the cost of attending one of a half dozen neighboring and, to my mind, quite inferior religious institutions. Why should I, ran my thinking, pay $500 a year tuition to attend a college of some five hundred students, taught in buildings anywhere from the mediocre to the shabby by underpaid professors whose precise academic standing was somewhat hazy, when I could for less than $100 a year attend an excellent institution of some 30,000 students, guided by a well-paid faculty which never had to worry about receiving its paychecks, and in buildings well heated and well groomed.

But something is happening to my thinking. War-years, disclosing a sad deficiency in some young lives lived close to me, of standards, roundness of character, fitness for life as well as for income purposes—and much of that lack, no doubt, traceable to the schools from which they came. Just years taking their inevitable toll on the sharp edges of one's prejudices; and post-war years, rampant as they have been with private and civic indecencies on a planetary scale—all these, and then more subtle factors too, have drawn me to the conclusion that however prudent my schoolday decisions were, they did not tell the whole story. Education at the public level is in sad state today. It has been for half a century, but whether President Eliot or Professor Dewey is most at fault, the matter is patently true.

I

Just how one puts the matter may be a matter of indifference. Our thermo-nuclear age, just dawning, has only dramatized the fault, not caused it. Things "riding mankind" so cruelly that one day the poet's drab, prophetic words may well come true.

"Here were decent godless people:
Their only monument the asphalt road
And a thousand lost golf balls",[1]

We are beginning to see from our various vantage points that "The universities have given the world the guidance it needed

1—T. S. Eliot *"The Rock"*

in science, economics and sociology, but not in the knowledge of good and evil. Hence they have failed to help civilization where it most needs help."[2] Or, as Norman Cousins inverts the matter, thinking the term "higher education" to be a misnomer not so much through the fault of the educator as through history which "stopped crawling about eighty years ago and began to catapult", "either something has happened to education or to us, but more than likely, it's happened to both".

The challenge comes from all sides. The IOWAN, the college daily of the University near which I was stationed during much of the war, carried an editorial one day addressed "to the faculty and the administration of universities and colleges across the land". This young writer insisted—with considerably more restraint than the recent critic of one of the Ivy League colleges—that the teachers share *now* the burden that will become the students' burden once the war is over. In harsh, perhaps impolite, yet vivid words, he cried,

> "The rank and file of us have never been trained in how to live.
>
> You haven't taught us to be able to take it.
>
> We are not living within our means; we followed your example.
>
> We don't know the meaning of discipline; you didn't discipline us.
>
> What are you going to do about it?"

And then he continued, suggesting a remedy which smacks of integration and challenges the elective system, "We have grown tired to death of smatterings of knowledge dispensed by professors and instructors hired to teach that smattering and nothing more. We want to get our teeth into something vibrant and alive, something permanent, something which ties the present to the truths of the glorious past. We want discipline in the job of living. . . . You've got to go back to solid ground again." Then, insisting that this want was the same whether a student were taking medicine, law or history, the editor concluded, "We want it every day! We want it as the backbone of higher education".

Some time ago, Dorothy Thompson published in the LADIES HOME JOURNAL a letter sent by an undergraduate of an Eastern University to its president. The student reminded the president of his Christian background as a boy, his Church experience, the Bible reading and Christian ethics of the educator's boyhood. He commented on the clear-cut distinction between good and evil, the loyalty to country, the nobility of man which had been part and parcel of the educator's home life. Then came the cutting words, "But what about us, the youth of America? What have we been taught in the university you direct, and in other similar institutions throughout the land? Personally, I fail to understand how you, or any other college president, can expect us to become ardent Christians and democrats when the vital postulates on which these faiths are supposed to rest are daily undermined in the classrooms."

Both of these critiques seem a bit histrionic in their outspokenness. But the general meaning is phrased again in the "Outline of Propositions for Discussion" at the meeting of The National Student Council of the YMCA held in Oxford, Ohio in 1952. Reaching for a definition of the role the "Y" should play in campus life today, the outline said, in part, "The general tendency of the university today is to treat intellectual inquiry in such a way that it provides very little resource for the cultivation of the spirit. . . . This situation is intolerable for us. For we cannot move toward confidence in our own future and we cannot find promise of adequate energy for engaging the critical issues of American society as long as the realms of mind and spirit are divided against each other."

Beyond these student critiques, there have been several challenges both from within and without the ranks of university

2—Tennessee Valley College Assn. Proceedings, 1943, quoted p. 33. Howard Lowry, *"The Mind's Adventure"*

leadership. The Rev. Dr. George Buttrick's well-known chapter on "Christ and Education" in his volume, CHRIST AND MAN'S DILEMMA in which higher education is held to be "bound within earth and time", states quite flatly that "Religion must once more be given central place in education lest the merely secular prove our doom".[3] Buttrick's later book, FAITH AND EDUCATION, sounds the same note with more footnotes. Sir Walter Moberly has written THE CRISIS OF THE UNIVERSITY. And President Howard Lowry of Wooster College has perhaps sounded the clearest note in his volume, THE MIND'S ADVENTURE. Moberly, summing up the failure of the university, says that students "under the guise of academic neutrality . . . are subtly conditioned to unthinking acquiescence in the . . . *status quo* and in a secularism on which they have never seriously reflected . . . Fundamentally they are uneducated".[4] Dr. Ganse Little, speaking at the 160th General Assembly of the U.S.S., said, "Unless the Church makes us hear a voice not our own voice, we shall perish"; and, commenting on this statement, President Lowry wrote "The challenge is equally valid for colleges and universities —not just as a crudely important matter of survival, but as a matter of giving to human beings, in any time or season, the full life and stature that belongs to them".[5]

From every side,—from the frustrated schoolboy put to a man's task with a child's tools, from the petulant clergyman resenting with holy anger the exclusion of religion from life's curriculum, from the calm-thinking Christian humanist, comes a similar complaint: American education is held in the balance and it weighs short. And that Harvard University appointed a University Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society in 1943, gave it $60,000 and 18 months to come up with answers and then published its report in 1945 "nominally addressing President Conant", but "really addressed to 'the whole nation' ", is viewed by some as salutary; and by others as too little if not also too late.

3—op. cit., 146
4—Buttrick, F/E, 104
5—op. cit., 36, 37

II

What, then, are the interior signs of this educational decay in our times? What, the reasons? They are varied, but perhaps they all relate to what underlies the term "secular". They reflect our basic American materialism which, for all our prating about ideals and democracy, lies so close to the surface of our campaigns and our pilgrimages that few in the world are fooled but those who are themselves Americans. "Bound within earth and time", that is the major sign.

Symptomatic of this is our long-time battle between those who support an education for making a life and those who prefer an education for making a living. "Business engineering", we used to call the economics hall on our home campus —where hundreds of students congregated for every six or so who studied Plato. Perhaps it is the historic cleavage between facts and ideas which really antedate President Eliot and the elective system, as even Gilbert and Sullivan knew.

Perhaps it is true, as Ernest Ernest suggests in his article in the American Scholar, "Even A.B.'s Must Eat", that the humanities have not been sold properly— What a girl really wants is not a bachelor's degree but a bachelor—, that it is selling the liberal education "short" to pit it against the "useful". But Robert Hutchins, whatever may be his peripheral shortcomings, has seen clearly that "If we cannot give a liberal education to every citizen in proportion to his capacity to receive it, we might as well give up our hopes of achieving a democratic community. We cannot insist on free men and at the same time say that we cannot educate our population for freedom. We cannot insist on a community and at the same time say that it is impossible to lay

the basis of communication among our people".[6]

It is sheer meanness, one suspects, that causes the critic of the humanities to quip that if a "use" cannot be found for something, "there is always the suspicion that . . . it will be asserted to have 'higher values'—like an impractical coffee urn kept in the china closet as an *objet-d'art.*"[7] How much of this revolt from the intelligent to the useful has been due to a memory of depression years is debatable; but those memories might recall, too, that it was possible for a university president in 1936 to get 500 Ph.D.s for $750 a year, any day in the week. Not only humanists suffered; "experts" did, too.

And what, one asks, is a humanist or a humanity? Ernest Ernest obliges: "A *humanist*: a person who teaches some subject other than science or a vocation; and *humanity*: a subject that students must be required to take along with the ones they really want". Well, somebody has been selling somebody short. The degrees that have been peddled in lunchroom management and shoecobbling and canoe-handling, *ad nauseam,* could well be offset in their effect were proper steps taken by somebody, by the employers who hire Ph.D.s these days hoping to get men, only to find that they got another technician. The occupational usefulness of the humanities might well be stressed, but that's not the point.

Education should do more than give a man a living; it ought to make him worth the trouble. It should make him literate. It should make him good company. It should give him legs and feet to stand on in adversity. It should make him a free man. But our times show that it has done none of these. "Man was born free, and everywhere he is in chains" of some sort or other. But enough of this. Here lies the body, at any rate—

And because men have chosen to be made useful rather than intelligent, they have missed their chance to be really useful; they have become only destructive. Somehow, somewhere the ideal must be recaptured.

What other symptoms can we detect? We live in a scientific age, we are told. That means we are led around by the nose by those who belong to the "cult of objectivity", as Lowry calls the enemy. "Phillistines", Babbitt called them. Facts, not ideas; "truth", not ideals have held our fancy. And much as Henry Ford, because he could make lots of Model Ts, could sail a Peace Ship to Europe, so science, because it has made gadgets, has insisted on being heard in the philosophy classroom. With this scientific success, the "cult of objectivity" has "jumped the track". It has become more than the honest pursuit of truth. It has become almost a religion itself . . ." And its new god now tyrannizes life, controls education. But insists Lowry, as Paul Elmore More insisted before him, this "Demon of the Absolute" is not philosophy; it is faith. And "the conception of reason as an impeccable judge holding antiseptic court in a vacuum is a wilder kind of wishful thinking than that religion is so often accused of".[8]

George Buttrick contributes to this disclosure when he "takes direct issue with the hidden assumptions of secular education".[9] Education insists it takes no stand; but by its refusal to take a stand, it becomes a bigot. Pleading it moves "not by faith, but by facts", education in America makes "one of the sorriest of assumptions". It says, in effect, "Perhaps God does not exist; perhaps he is only the projection of wishful thinking. If He does exist, He does not matter, at least not enough for us to risk religious controversy. Let the church schools talk about Him. Whatever our compunctions, no great harm is done by leaving Him unmentioned during the school week". And

6—Harpers, October 1941, *"Education for Freedom"*
7—Ernest Ernest, *"Even A.B's Must Eat"* AMERICAN SCHOLAR Autumn 1944
8—Lowry, 75
9—X & MD, 141

then he presses, "If this doctrine is sound, secular education is on the right lines. But if (it) is unsound . . . secular education is tragically blind".

A third symptom of our earthboundness might be termed our mistaken notion of our American heritage of the separation of Church and State. Whatever may be the inherent rights of the present anti-discrimination efforts, it is doubtful whether some of them can be supported by the meaning of those wisely, carefully thought out words, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The "paradox" in America's religious ignorance is that in a day when only 5% of Americans had any church connection, religion and education were hand in glove. But today, when over 50% of our population are professing church members, religion and education aren't even on speaking terms. It presses one's credulity too far to believe that this is enlightened Christendom practicing tolerance. Somebody has sold somebody a pig in a poke.

Humanity-wise, it may be right to say that "man's whole intellectual history is a short story without the knowledge of his quest for religious faith". Tolerance-wise, to exclude it from university curriculum or from secondary school curriculum, for that matter, on so-called constitutional grounds may one day be found to be as illegal as it now seems illogical. And if Harvard investigators are yet blind to this, the National Council of Independent Schools plainly declares in its report on the Functions of Secondary Education in the United States, "The tradition of American education derives from faith in God, faith in man, and the ideal of the widest educational opportunities for all. The disestablishment of churches was not intended to interfere with the faith of the people of the United States in a Supreme Being. . . . This is a spiritual heritage to which our children are entitled".[10] And the oft-heard complaint in some circles, that the Church is trying to get the schools to do its work, is improper. Just whose work is it to place faith and standards into the body politic? Maybe America will have to reface that problem.

Part of this mistaken interpretation of the separation of Church and State has issued from our differences in creed. The Roman Catholic, whose freedom of religion where practiced is one of expedience and not of principle, is always at odds with freedom. He can afford to be "difficult" for expedience also. The Jew fears the invasion of his minority rights, and regards religious moves in educational circles with suspicion. The atheist minorities have frequently been vocal, and even successful, beyond just limits. The upshot of it all has been that a deeper wedge has been driven between Church and State than was intended, and deeper than the possible sectarian coercions require. But the wedge is there. And "In our fear of indoctrination, we have practiced a worse indoctrination: by our silences in secular education we have indoctrinated children to believe that God does not exist and that Jesus Christ does not matter. In protecting the scruples of agnostics we have trampled roughshod over the convictions of believers. This debacle has come so slowly that most people still do not realize its iconoclastic import."[11] And one or a dozen atomic scientists taking elder's orders won't heal the breach.

III

What, then, are the possible changes to our recent past and present failure in Faith and Education? "Diagnosis is often easier than cure". And the role of criticism does not carry with it the necessity of construction; nor does the present writer hold the key to that kind of wisdom. But there are some moves suggested in the very train of our thought thus far ,and others which have been suggested by those who are studying the problem.

10—F/E, 103

11—F/E, 135, 356

Buttrick, for instance, whose critique is clearer than his solution, and for the obvious reason that even a good clergyman can't be an expert at everything, almost gives the lie to that conclusion, when he wisely lays his finger on the pulse: "There may be more important standards", he writes, "than educational standards, even for education; for education is still only an adjective to the noun, life".[12] That's approximately what the humanist has been asserting since Erasmus, nay, since Cicero. Life is greater than logic; truth is broader than the factual.

Alfred North Whitehead sensed this when he wrote AIMS IN EDUCATION. But that was in 1929 and nobody cared. His book should have been published in 1931.

> "Instead of (a single intellectual) unity, we offer children Algebra, from which nothing follows; Geometry, from which nothing follows; Science, from which nothing follows; History, from which nothing follows; a couple of languages, never mastered; and lastly, most dreary of all, Literature, represented by plays of Shakespeare, with philological notes and short analyses of plot and character to be in substance committed to memory. Can such a list be said to represent Life, as it is known in the midst of the living of it?"[13]

What, to challenge this? A return to a common core, says the Harvard report. A "General Education"—"general" being more up-to-date, less frightening term for "liberal"—must be reestablished. Holding that "a supreme need of American education is for a unifying purpose and idea", the Report would have the four-year undergraduate college emphasize the sciences, social sciences and humanities in a useful and related amalgam, hoping, as it says, thereby "to break the strangle-hold of the present upon the mind" by re-introducing men to the past.[14]

The aim of this common-core of General Education? To foster the ability of men and women "to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, to discriminate among values".

The Report, beyond this, is disappointing to some men of religion. It recognizes the need of standing on the shoulders of the past. It acknowledges that democracy owes faith a debt of gratitude for the "ideals of human dignity and human duty to others, drawing much upon the 'similarly interwoven commandments of the love of God and the love of neighbor' ". It admits that care has been taken not to define education in such exclusive terms as to rule religion out. But it confesses, "WE MUST PERFORCE SPEAK IN PURELY HUMANIST TERMS". It really damns religion by faint praise; though realizing without religion its aims cannot be achieved.

What, more precisely, is this liberal education now termed "general"? Robert Hutchins puts the matter succinctly; Howard Lowry says it more poetically. Writes Hutchins,

> "The cultural heritage of America is the civilization of Western Europe. The means of understanding is the liberal arts, the arts of reading, writing, speaking, and calculating. Education for freedom consists in transmitting to the rising generation the civilization they have inherited, together with the techniques by which it may be understood. No man or woman is equipped to be a ruler in America without this education."[15]

Writes Lowry, "The liberally educated man has learned perspective also. . . . There is an island within himself, an 'inward endowment' and resource that is beyond the fortunes of business and politics. He draws on the humane past and thus lives a life antecedent to his birth. . . . Reasons and facts mean more to him than propaganda. . . . He feels his debt to others and the worth and dignity of other

12—p. 65 F/E
13—p. 10
14—Lowry, 50 ff

15—Harpers, 1941 *"Education for Freedom"*

men out of those things which have possessed his own mind and heart.[16]

"No sleek adventure in shrewdness and mere self-interest", is this general education by which men of Israel, beginning in Jerusalem, would supplant President Eliot's elective system. "It has one superb object above all others—to open the mind and heart, under law, to the highest excellence and most significant life possible to man".[17]

And what beyond this? I have indicated that the Harvard Report is aware of a greater indebtedness to Christian faith and standards than its authors are prepared to write into their program. Lowry has no such inhibitions. He wants a department of religion smack in the center of the liberal curriculum. "Liberal education itself", he insists, "creates the need for the examination of religion and religious values". Buttrick is even more outspoken. He would help men to ask the right questions by placing the Great Commandment at the center of education. How he would do it, is not plain. At least not on the college level. On the school level, he favors a curriculum of religion common to Jew, Catholic and Protestant. He even urges that, in event of a lack of agreement, "it would be better—however unfortunate and schismatic—for each faith to build its own schools rather than continue with a merely secular education".[18]

But college-wise, he sees Duke University built on cruciform lines, with a Chapel at the top of the Cross, and sees love to God and love to man as the "design for living" of American education, if it is to last—but makes no clear suggestions.

One who is a layman would hesitate to define a proper course for American education to take. It is still possible, in some colleges by design, in most colleges on the student's volition, to get a "liberal education". The complaint of all of the complainants has simply been that for those who, for reasons of their own, don't wish it, a liberal education is not available; and that those who do are yet accomplishing that end in an atmosphere, while pleading to be neutral, that is yet infected by the virus of a most potent faith in the optional character of religion in general and the Christian religion in particular.

If a liberal education could be redefined, in our privacy, as the disclosure of the best assumptions and the articulation of the finer prejudices, it would become apparent that the Christian faith has a place at the head of the list, if not as the Queen of the Sciences, still as the chief reason why they exist. "A credo is the unfurling of a banner rather than an exercise in logic".[19] The Christian faith is the first assumption in education in a democracy.

All of which meandering reminds me of a conversation in Galsworthy's MAID IN WAITING. " 'Providence is too remote, Mother,' says the daughter. 'It's too remote. I suppose there is an eternal plan, but we are like gnats for all the care it has of us.' 'Don't encourage such feelings, Dinny,' rejoins the mother, 'they affect one's character.' 'I don't see the connection between beliefs and character,' was the reply. 'I'm not going to behave any worse because I cease to believe in Providence or in an after life. . . . If I'm decent it's because decency's the decent thing and not because I'm going to get anything by it.' . . . But mother's final rejoinder gets to the root of the matter. 'Yes, but *why* is decency the decent thing if there's no God?' "[20]

Perhaps for reasons like this, Lowry is being asked by students to work with educators in a course of study which would like, early in the curriculum, "some questions worthy to be asked". Answers are harder, and another matter.

16—MA, 66
17—op. cit.
18—p. 148, X/MD

19—Butt., F/E, 7
20—Reade, Why Be Good, p. 21

That we may better profit from the Service of Communion.

ON COMING TO THE LORD'S TABLE

by CHARLES A. BALDWIN*

So you always stay home on Communion Sunday! It has nothing to do with you, you say. Allow me to argue with you a bit.

In a way, going to Communion is like going to a truly great play or movie—that is, the kind of production that makes you see yourself or your world and makes you laugh that wonderful kind of laugh that comes with self-acceptance; or, perhaps, makes you cry the kind of crying that comes from sharing in true tragedy or sadness or loss. Sometimes the laughing and the crying will go together. Smiles and tears are mixed, like the time the wire came saying your son was safe in the prison camp. It is the kind of drama that makes eyes and heart and the whole self see and feel and know some part of life that you don't often see or don't want to see ever, the kind of drama you don't mind seeing again and again. The Lord's Supper is something like that.

Oh, I know mostly when you've been it has reminded you more of a very bad show, long and dull and having nothing to do with this world. And I hear your argument, too, that after all a movie or a play isn't real. The ones who act it out aren't that way at all in real life, except sometimes.

But wait, that's only partly true. A play can be all too real; so much so that we are made to know inside that it has to do with us. The actors are playing out life as we know it to be. When they say, or do, or pretend to feel things as we do; or when they worry, or look foolish, or have a good time, or are alone, like us; then it is not as if it were another world or outside us. It was that way when I saw *Marty*. We used to sit around like Marty and the boys asking each other, "Well, what do you want to do tonight?" The answer always was, "I don't know. What do you want to do tonight?" And we were shy, but then sometimes felt we were in love. How happy we were when we found out it was true. That kind of drama which recalls in humor and depth our past and shows us what we were and are, that's pretty real. I tell you it's like that in the Lord's Supper. Even though it all happened so long ago, every time the Supper is received, what happened then is recalled, and we are made onlookers; and, if we believe what happened, more than onlookers. We even share in the whole experience. There is the catch, though: if you don't believe that God in some way was there in Christ, if the whole business is a lot of foolishness to you (except that maybe he said a lot of good things and gave some sensible advice); then coming to the Table can only be a kind of frustrating exercise. But for the church, every time the Lord's Supper is celebrated the whole wonderful drama is "represented." The faithful people recall what happened and what it means to them, and they are renewed by the recollection. The church affirms again and again that this incredible thing is true. God, the very One who rules all—the almighty One, the Creator, the Mover of all that is—this same One is also gracious. He has come to men and has shown forth his love and has suffered for us, even though we deserve his suffering and death. And more, he has made an eternal promise of forgiveness and release from all evil—even death itself. This is the drama of the Lord's Supper. It has to do with our memory of the past, a memory

*The writer is Associate Minister of Central Congregational Church in Providence, R. I.

powerful unto the present and the ground of our hope in the future. Memory and imagination are both involved together. Memory is rich unto thanksgiving; for God did not withdraw defeated and rejected, but rather remains by his Spirit victorious among us. Our imaginations are filled with hope and new intentions and courage for now and for the future.

True, it is not such an experience for many. They are, as it were, only viewers or witnesses of the event: even so, they may get the message being given. But others, when the event is re-enacted, will participate in it. They will take the bread and the cup and give thanks for what God has done for them. They become a party to Christ's dying in all its sorrow and its mystery. They follow his command that they should remember him in this way. They believe in the power of his presence with them. Do not misunderstand; Christians are not always people of great self-confidence and assurance and conviction. Like the first ones who sat with him they are not quite ready to be fully loyal even in his presence, nor do they know altogether what they are doing or what he did. When they leave the Table, they are very likely to treat it all somewhat lightly lest someone accuse them of being a follower of his. Peter did that too. Yet disloyal, hesitant, doubting, they come to share the event again, offering themselves for his sake, beseeching forgiveness and renewal for their lives. When a man comes to the Lord's Table with this in mind, he is no spectator but one of the actors in the drama.

Then it all depends on how you come?

No, no! Not all. It is more, you see, than an inner personal experience. As we said before, a man might come unbelieving and unprepared and yet be caught up in the action. There is something going on which doesn't depend on your being there. The tale being told, the promises given, the forgiveness offered belong to God and not to us. It is our Lord who meets us there, not just the minister and the deacons. They are more like waiters on the Table; our Lord is the host. But whether you personally will receive anything other than a piece of bread and a sip of wine is largely determined by you. I mean you have to come ready and willing to take your part, and your part is a big one; you have to be prepared. Remember the words the minister often says? "Ye who do truly and earnestly repent of your sins and are in love and charity with your neighbors and intend to lead a new life following the commandments of God and walking from henceforth in his holy ways, draw near with faith and take this holy sacrament to your comfort." That is a big order.

First, there is self-examination and confession. Think of it this way: When you come before the Lord's Table you are about to present yourself to the One most worthy of your love and trust and respect. You know something of what that One expects of you; you must be ready. Therefore, you must look at yourself, at your whole life—personal, family and business—all of it. What have you been doing lately? What things have taken up your time? How have you dealt with your family and your friends? What about your business decisions? There have been mistakes and outright wrong doings and then a multitude of deeds which can only be called "our best." Most times nowadays, after searching all our motives and applying all our principles and all our knowledge, we can't be certain that what we do is right. Life will not allow us to be pure and spotless.

I am sure you do try to live a good life, but listen as I try to explain. I am talking about how our intentions so often do not match up with our deeds. And I am talking about how uncertain so much of our living is. Let me tell you of a man I know and saw recently. One of his sons is a mental invalid and has been since birth. He and his wife kept the child several years in their home, endured the heartbreak and gave themselves for that child. After a time, with much urging from

friends and doctors, with the pressure of finances and the problems of family life with the other children, they sent the child to an institution. Now everyone says he will be better off there. After all, it's only just that the family should be free from this burden of care and anxiety and the interruption of their life. Yet, the father and mother are sometimes overcome by the feeling that they were wrong about it, that they were being irresponsible. They did what they felt was right according to knowledge and the best interests of all concerned; and yet it cannot be a happy, clear decision, for they must always wonder, I suppose, whether they have fulfilled their obligation to the child. My example is a personal one, but many could be drawn also from a man's business decisions and his political choices. So much of life is that way. Decisions are not always clear and sure and happy. And so every time that he and you and I make our confessions, we must bring to God our concerns over the way in which we have been bound to act, and must beseech forgiveness and release from our guilt. Before God we offer up our actions; and he takes them, however feeble, and uses and redeems them. I haven't said it very well, but that's something of the way you have to come to the Lord's Table. Lots of times it's not the things we know are wrong, that we can see are wrong and accept as wrong, it's the things we aren't sure of where we have done our best but cannot claim that even our best is eternally good. These must be offered up too, and in the offering we receive the comfort we need, a kind of release that frees us to go on making judgments.

And then, what about "love and charity with your neighbor"? The way Jesus talked we know that the neighbor is not just next door but every man, everywhere. In a way, you see, the congregation must present not only themselves and their own relationships before God but they will have to represent all men, this nation, and the world, and man's collective guilt before the Almighty, beseeching to be cleansed and lifted up. When you come to the Lord's Table you must come with an offering, the only one you have: yourself and your life. You must bring all of it, the good and the bad, the stupidity and the error, the blindness and the gladness. You with the whole congregation offer yourself. Moreover, you claim as your own the sin of the whole world (though it surely isn't all your fault) and offer it, too. Then you ask forgiveness and strength for renewal.

There's the second part of it. You make for yourself some new resolutions, and you pray God that they may be confirmed. Your new intentions probably won't be really new, for you know the commandments and the teachings of our Lord, and you know that your life should be given over to them. You affirm again and again that to these things, to the constant service of his will and the love of men, you will give yourself and that you desire to walk from henceforth in his holy ways.

Now you are ready to come to the Table; not fearful, neither arrogant nor proud, but humble and sure of his promise of forgiveness, peace, and strength. In presenting yourself and receiving the elements, you will know renewal, hope, and comfort. And, too, in this act you share in the event by which the church shows forth for all men, both within the church and without, the living Lord of history and of life, even Jesus Christ.

I know! It's so incredible, this thing that we Christians believe! It all rests upon believing that God came to us in Christ. It *is* incredible. God loves us and gave himself for us: this is the awesome claim. Yet sometimes I think I understand why it had to be that way. I understood a little, one night, as I sat and listened to a mother cry out about her son long since gone astray. How would she show forth the love which she had for him and the love he so desperately needed? She had said so in words and had acted out the words she had spoken. And more, she had sought to understand his life and

need. She had learned to live in his dirty, cluttered apartment. She was with him in his sadness and his kind of happiness. His hurt was her pain and his well-being her daily concern. By love she sought to lead him out, but she had failed and been refused. It was that kind of love that God showed for us in Jesus Christ. He shared our life: our temptation and weakness and sickness, our joy and our doubt. He knew that final desperate loneliness and despair we know when we feel completely forgotten. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" I tell you this is the drama at the Holy Table. We are invited to be a part of what Christ was and did. We will come, thankful but humble—even confident, offering ourselves to him for his own purposes. Our trials and our sufferings are caught up in his; and, as always, when someone is a part of our life, the burden is thereby made light. Our joys and happiness are confirmed by him as a sign of God's promise for the future. We will come and say our prayers, and we will pray for the whole world and for the whole church in the confident knowledge that the whole world is his and the victory also. "Draw near with faith and receive this holy sacrament to your comfort."

Do you catch the drama now? God has come in Christ Jesus, and at the Table he is present again and again to receive those who believe in him, offering them forgiveness and renewal and hope and joy. Do not tell me it has nothing to do with you. It has to do with every man who knows the fullness of life and has been a part of life's myriad experiences. Any man who has known moral doubt and confusion, the hard complexity of joy and frustration and even tragedy, the difficult decisions, the seeming determinism of circumstance and time. Any man who knows life thus knows, too, the power of the Supper of our Lord.

So, I beseech you, make ready. Present yourself and your life before God. Let your confession be made, and declare your new intent. Then, come to the Table and receive the bread and the cup, recalling God's wondrous works of mercy, praying for self and all men, accepting his Holy offering with thanksgiving. Then go forth, showing our Lord's sacrifice, until the time when his kingdom shall come.

The preceding article is reprinted by permission of the Department of Evangelism, Board of Home Missions of the Congregational Christian Churches and is available in quantity from Pilgrim Press.

What is his theological and philosophical orientation?

ON LISTENING TO GERALD HEARD

by JOSEPH F. KING*

OVER THE LAST FIFTEEN YEARS I have read most of the twenty non-fiction books of Gerald Heard and during the last five years I have traveled three hundred miles twice to hear him lecture. This reading and listening has left me with at least two distinct reactions. One was to say, "If this man really knows as much as he seems to know, he knows more than anyone alive." The other reaction was to ask, "What is he—anthropologist, historian, theologian, historian? and what is his theological and philosophic orientation—Christian, Hindu, Buddhist, Scientific Humanist or eclectic?"

These two reactions formed again as Gerald Heard gave the Haskell Lectures under the auspices of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, on the subject, "The Perennial Praxis—A Contemporary View of Mysticism." Here was immense learning and familiarity with almost every conceivable field of human learning. His lectures sparkled and scintillated with apt quotation and reference to an amazingly large number of writers and fields, and they were delivered—though "conversed" would be more accurate—in as beautiful, precise and fluent an English style as one is ever likely to hear.

The same question which occurred to me, formed in the minds of many of his hearers: what is this man's philosophical orientation? At lunch one day I mentioned my quandary. He laughed and I said, "Before you tell me, let me guess." "Yes," he said, "guess." "I guess", I said, "that you take your psychological exercizes from Buddhism, filtering through modern depth psychology; that you take your metaphysical presuppositions from modern science, and that your ethical affirmations come from the Jewish-Christian tradition."

Then with a bit of indirection which characterized his responses to all the questions after his lectures, he said, "Christianity is the most dramatic of all the religions. That is its strength—as drama-story, not as theological system. In so far as I am a dramatist, and every man is to some degree, I am a Christian; in so far as I am an artist, I am a Taoist; in so far as I am a thinker, I am a Buddhist." Thus did Gerald Heard label himself.

One could hear after these lectures the criticism that at no time did Mr. Heard carefully define mysticism. When I repeated this comment to a student of Oriental religions, he remarked, "But mysticism cannot be defined." Nevertheless, if I were to try to state what Mr. Heard meant in these lectures by contemporary mysticism I would say he meant integral thinking, or thinking with the deep mind as well as with the surface, rational mind, in contrast to analytical and discursive thinking with the surface mind. With integral thinking one reaches thereby, Mr. Heard would say, "the Beyond that is within."

One could sense in the Oberlin reaction the same resistances which Mr. Heard encounters almost everywhere. These resistances fall into one or the other of two categories, for the most part. One is the rationalist—scientist resistance. It stems in part from a combination of

*The writer is Minister of the First Congregational Church of Oberlin, Ohio.

dubiety and irritation that one man could know so much. It is fed, for some, by the beauty and eloquence of his speech and his quoting of poetry. This is somehow just not academic cricket. But the dubiety-irritation reaction also comes from the fact that this man seems to be out on the frontier bringing finding and insights from different fields together and in a way that smacks of philosophy and theology. This seems to be going too far for the rationalist-scientist.

But Heard prompts resistance in people of a definite theological orientation. This too is a many-sided reaction. For one thing, Heard is an eclectic and eclecticism is not in theological fashion at the moment. Or, to say the same thing in another way, Heard transcends the historical religious communities and is not clearly and solely Jewish, Christian, Hindu, Buddist, Protestant or Catholic. His critics would say he "abstracts" himself from the particularities and ambiguities of historical existence to take lodgment in an absolute which is his own construct.

Theologians tend to resist him, in addition, because of his high evaluation of the place and importance of science and his insistence on the crucial importance of natural theology, that is, theology that rests heavily upon dialogue with the findings of science and a use of these findings as a test of truth-not the whole truth, for that science cannot establish or find, but of that important part of truth which science can establish. And to irritate the theologians further, Gerald Heard is a complete and thorough-going naturalist.

Some rationalist-scientists and theologians join hands to resist Heard's hopefulness. He believes that the unique thing about man is that he is unfinished. The animals, he says, "have had it", but man is unfinished and now faces a high challenge to enter his next evolutionary stage, the evolution of consciousness whereby man's deep mind and his rational mind may be made one and new focal lengths of consciousness be attained and thus bring under constructive control the immense powers which man's discursive mind has brought into being.

Gerald Heard is 69 years of age. He was educated at Cambridge where he took undergraduate honors in history and did graduate work in philosophy. He lectured for Oxford University, edited *The London Realist,* a journal of Scientific Humanism which Heard, with H. G. Wells, Arnold Bennett and Julian Huxley, founded. Before coming to this country with his friend Aldous Huxley, he was the science editor and commentator for the B.B.C. In the last thirty years he has written 34 books of which 14 are science fiction and mystery stories. His major books in recent years include, *Pain, Sex and Time, Is God in History? Is God Evident?* and *The Human Venture.* Many of his Oberlin hearers would echo what Aldous Huxley said of him, "Gerald Heard is that rare being—a learned man who makes his home on the vacant spaces between the pigeon-holes."

THE MINISTER AND THE WORLD CHURCH

Dept. Editor: WILLIAM L. BRADLEY, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn.

From July 2-10 the International Congregational Council will meet in Assembly on the campus of Hartford Seminary Foundation. Here, Dr. Stafford, President of the Seminary and long prominent in international Congregational affairs, describes the significance of the meeting.

WORLD CONGREGATIONALISM AT HARTFORD

by RUSSELL HENRY STAFFORD

IN 1891 AT London Congregationalists from all over the world came together for a meeting of minds on vital Christian issues, in a conclave which was designed and destined to become a permanent feature of our fellowship at the most inclusive level. Subsequent meetings were held at irregular intervals, twice in the United States, once in England, once in Scotland, prior to the meeting at Wellesley in 1949. In that session a permanent organization was effected, so that the International Congregational Council was graduated from convention status into that of a regularly delegated body organic to the life and work of its worldwide constituency.

From the outset of this vigorous fresh development, and through the session of 1953 at St. Andrews, the Council had as its secretary Dr. Sidney M. Berry, known and loved by us all. Upon his retirement he was replaced by the Rev. Ralph F. G. Calder, who had well prepared for these more extensive duties by long service as an executive of the Colonial Missionary Society. In both administrations Miss Dorothy Biggs has been the Associate Secretary, with special responsibility for work with women and youth. At St. Andrews Dr. S. Maurice Watts, the distinguished minister of our Mill Hill Church in London, was elected Moderator for the current term.

The interval between meetings has now been set at five years. Accordingly, the next Assembly of the International Congregational Council will be held this coming summer. The dates are from the second through the tenth of July. The place is the campus of The Hartford Seminary Foundation for most sections and seminars, and in our Hartford Churches for large public meetings, but mostly in Immanuel, the nearest to the campus.

This Assembly will bring together an extraordinarily wide range of people representing many different strains of Christian thought and usage, yet united in basic devotion to the freedom of the faith and in recognizing the local Church as the primary unit of Christian community. Alongside us old-line British and American Congregationalists, with our Puritan heritage and our predominantly liberal or neo-liberal temper, there will be near-Fundamentalists from the Mission Covenant Church of Sweden, near-Unitarians from the Remonstrant Brethren of the Netherlands, near-Lutherans from the Palatinate, and many other shades too. Delegates will be in attendance from two episcopally governed bodies: the Church of South India and the United Church

of the Philippines; and from at least three bodies in which several polities are blended: the United Church of Canada, the United Church of North India, and the Church of Christ in Japan.

Yet, whatever else or more they may be, all these bodies call themselves Congregational. And who shall say that they are not? After all, Congregationalists are more recognizable, even among us in America, by the kind of people they are than by any set of ideas or practices they hold in common. For all who were there, St. Andrews was proof that these others really are our kind of people.

For St. Andrews we Americans set up the program, and we prescribed a sectarian theme: "Congregational Churchmanship." From that theme the Council as a whole shied off as soon and as far as it could. For it raised no burning question in these bitter years of peril and perplexity. For Hartford the British are setting up the program. And for its theme they have chosen: "God Speaks to Our World." That is a theme which goes to the heart of our current anxieties. We may expect great presentations, illuminating discussions, and conclusions in the Message which will help to clarify Christian thought and focus Christian aims in quarters far beyond our own.

Visitors will be welcome. But the actual roll of the Assembly, not counting a few supernumeraries such as officers and leaders, will be made up of seventy-five delegates and seventy-five associates from each of three areas: the United States; Great Britain; and the rest of the world: four hundred fifty in all. If St. Andrews affords ground for prediction, we shall see at Hartford no denominational parade, but a cross-section of the World Church, at grips with great problems for Christ's sake; a working section, as it were, of the World Council of Churches: by no means counter to that greater Council of which also we are a part, but deliberately and effectually contributing to its ends. In the outcome we shall have more reason than ever to be proud of our affiliation with the free Churches of the world, and grateful for the influence they wield toward validation everywhere of the glorious liberty of the children of God.

A proposed merger will place the church on trial.

ECUMENICITY AND MISSIONS

by HUGH VERNON WHITE*

IT IS ALTOGETHER likely that very soon, perhaps in 1961, two great ecumenical bodies will be merged into one; the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. Looked at in the large this is a part of the present day movement of non-Roman Christianity toward unity, and unity in the form of organization. Centrifugal forces have operated for a long time in Protestantism, but for several decades the tide has been turning strongly in the opposite direction. The formation in 1948 of the World Council of Churches was for the ecclesiastical structure the final stage on this process. But a great organized part of ecumenical church life remained outside the World Council. This is not a Church in any sense of the word. It is not a denomination, a national Church or any other kind of ecclesiastical body. It is an interdenominational and international organ of all the Churches in the supremely important task of world missions. Now that the World Council of Churches exists, it seems the natural and logical thing that this truly ecumenical activity of the Church should become a part of that all inclusive structure.

But there are problems of various kinds involved in merging the two Councils. Some are problems of basic strategy, some concern more technical matters. Chief among the latter are those difficulties that arise from the fact that the W. C. C. is a Council of Churches, and is therefore essentially ecclesiastical in purpose; while the I. M. C. is made up of Councils and is essentially functional. This kind of problem, of course, can be solved if the two Councils are fully convinced on more important grounds that the merger is desirable. In fact fairly detailed plans have already been projected to accomplish organizational unity.

More important are the questions about the fundamental purposes and responsibilities of the I. M. C. Will the cause of world missions suffer by such a merger? This is the real issue.

The I. M. C. has arisen and developed and exists wholly for the one purpose—to proclaim the gospel to the world. In this it has really been the spearhead of the ecumenical movement. The missionary movement of which the I. M. C. is the organized expression has made ecumenicity a substantial geographical fact. It has planted the Church in the "inhabited world." This gives human and global reality to ecumenicity. The I. M. C. represents a world-wide activity engaging tens of thousands of full time workers, clerical and lay, from the sending churches, and millions of members and workers in the parts of the world where churches have arisen and developed through "missions." It has a total "budget" of hundreds of millions of dollars. In short this is ecumenicity, not of a theoretical but of a very practical sort. It is a going concern.

From another point of view the I. M. C. represents leadership in the ecumenical

*Dr. White is the Professor of Christian Theology and World Christianity at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

movement. As a sort of high point in a long series of interdenominational and international gatherings, the Missionary Conference which met in Edinburgh in 1910 became the generating point of developments that have resulted in the World Council of Churches. A Continuation Committee brought about the organization of the I. M. C. in 1921. This was the first step in ecumenical organization. In a series of general meetings, at Jerusalem in 1928, at Tambaram in 1938, and at Ghana in 1957, leaders of Churches from all parts of the world came together demonstrating the fact that Christianity is now a world faith.

If and when, therefore, the W. C. C. and the I. M. C. become one organizationally it will be merely a drawing together of lines of development that have a common origin and a common idea. They have never, in fact, been far apart. It is noteworthy that the three ecumenical gatherings in 1937 and 1938, Faith and Order at Edinburgh, Life and Work at Oxford, and the I. M. C. at Tambaram, were closely linked in leadership and personnel. A sort of unplanned system of "interlocking directorates" existed. To a considerable extent those who were at Tambaram had been at either Edinburgh or Oxford or both.

Since that time the two bodies have been engaging in joint enterprises. Dr. William Paton, secretary of the I. M. C., had been made Associate General Secretary of the World Council in formation in 1938. In 1946 The Joint Commission on International Affairs was formed. There is also a Department of Missionary Studies that serves both bodies. Both participated in the recent East Asia Christian Conference at Prapat on Sumatra. The Joint Committee which has been studying the matter of union has worked out plans for unification. Thus in program as well as in idea the two ecumenical Councils are being significantly integrated.

But the crucial question remains, and only the future will show the answer; will this merger diminish the drive of the missionary purpose? The whole Church may well be warned of this danger. The missionary movement has always been maintained, as it was started, by minority groups in the Churches who were passionately devoted to world evangelization. By and large, the Church has been much more preoccupied with doctrine, church extension, religious education, ecclesiastical affairs and social betterment in the home community. The missionary has been at once lauded and held a bit in contempt. He has had to subsist on what is left over after other nearer interests have been satisfied. Will the theological and ecclesiastical dignity to which missions have now been raised actually make them a real and urgent interest of the whole Church, or will it result in merely constituting the evangelization of the world a conventional department of the Ecumenical Movement? It is this that concerns those who are jealous for the missionary cause. The Church of the future will in a profound sense be on trial.

THE MINISTER AND THE DENOMINATION

Department Editor: RICHARD P. CARTER, 211 High Street, Suffield, Connecticut

The author of the following article is Educational Secretary for the American Board. His article speaks to our great concern for the churches that confront governments not always sympathetic to the Christian way of life.

CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP ON MISSION FIELDS

by DAVID M. STOWE

A friend who works on the newspaper sent over a section of the day's teletype output. It began: "New Delhi, India, Apr. 21 (Reuters)—The Government is taking action against a group of American missionaries who have been converting Indians to Christianity. . . ."

Missionaries from the West find themselves under increasing pressure in many areas of race-and-religion-sensitive Asia. Sometimes even strong representations by local Christians fail to obtain government OK for the entry or return of Christian workers from America. It is freely predicted that within the foreseeable future some of the major mission fields will be closed. The prophets of disaster may, of course, be all wrong. The state of the cold war and the relations between the United States and the newly arrived Asian and African countries can easily shift and make liars of either pessimists or optimists.

It is perfectly clear, however, that responsibility for the Christian enterprise in the traditional mission fields is passing into the hand of native leaders.

A massive illustration of the way younger churches may suddenly be thrown upon their own resources is provided by China. A widely noticed book has the title "The Lost Churches of China"—an absurd misnomer. But one could write about "The Lost Missions of China" for virtually all missionaries are gone—or jailed.

Under native leadership, however, the churches of China are very much alive and active. The institutions built by missions have been taken over by the government. But strictly church property is respected. In fact many city churches derive a substantial part of their income from rents. There is "freedom of religion," which means freedom of worship, though not necessarily of evangelism and certainly not of social action or community service. Church membership dropped sharply after "Liberation" in 1950-51, but has been climbing again. It is probable that Protestantism is at 70 to 90 per cent of its pre-Communist numerical strength, and in some respects much more alert theologically and more intense in its devotional life and Biblical orientation.

Before the revolution the Chinese church had a galaxy of brilliant leaders and spokesmen. Some of these have been purged; and there are a number of pathetic cases of thorough brain-washing. Some remain in positions of high influence.

Meanwhile a crop of ardent and ar-

ticulate young men and women have come into power. They seem to be authentically Christian in faith and intent, and quite certain that the church has a distinctive and necessary spiritual mission amid the official atheism and materialism of the current regime. Generally they are strong for church unity, within China. Protestantism is undoubtedly much more unified there than ever before. At the same time they have troubling characteristics:

1) They insist volubly upon the essential goodness and righteousness of the present regime, hence are leading the churches in a path of very intimate and cordial cooperation with the government at virtually every point.
2) They repudiate the missionary background of Chinese Christianity, labelling it paternalistic, repressive, hostile to the emergence of a free and genuinely Chinese church, and by and large the cats-paw of the imperialistic interests of Western powers. In doing so they ignore both Christian charity and many facts.
3) Underlying all is an uncritical nationalism. This accounts largely for their enthusiasm about the power and progress Communism has brought China, and for their criticism of foreign missions.

In sum, native Christian leadership in China has succeeded in carrying the churches through nearly a decade of profound revolutionary stresses and changes, maintaining and developing their religious program with real strength, with no help whatsoever from outside. At the same time, it has been somewhat weak in facing the nationalistic appeal of a progressive but totalitarian state based on profoundly anti-Christian principles.

The present leaders of such churches as those of China come out of missions which to some degree at least had attempted to prepare them for independence. The status now loudly trumpeted by the Red government-sponsored Three-Self Movement, "self-government, self-support, self-propagation," has been a goal of the American Board since at least 1836 when it adopted a plan "to raise up men in every place, men born and educated in the several countries, who may be ordained as pastors of the churches". In 1848 another statement spoke of the freedom and independence which is "the birthright of Christian converts in every part of the world."

Thus, long before Communism the China Missions of the American Board had turned over direction of the Christian enterprise to church bodies in which Chinese and missionaries sat as equals, with missionaries far out-numbered. Heads of virtually all mission-related institutions were Chinese. Missionaries worked as counsellors, specialists, colleagues, within the Chinese church. Great stress was laid on the development of strong native leadership. Advanced educational advantages were provided for the most promising.

Along similar lines the 11 missions of the American Board are today pushing toward strong native leadership and self-support. The latest American Board Annual Report (free on request—*adv.*) shows that some 334 missionaries from this country are working with over 14,000 native leaders in every kind of enterprise. The American churches put $1,426,528 into overseas work last year, while contributions from the people and churches related to mission enterprises totalled $1,643,822. On every single field the item of highest priority is "developing national leadership".

In Japan, the Philippines, Ceylon and South India the churches with which we are related are entirely self-governing and led by able men and women. In western India, Greece and Mexico the development of the churches is rapidly approaching this stage. In Micronesia and our African fields, because of the much lower level of education and general culture, the role of the missionary is more prominent. Significantly, however, the level of

self-support even in these areas is very high.

Concern to develop more native leadership and independence twists the tail of much missionary planning today, and issues in three major emphases.

One is the strategy of multi-lateral inter-church relationships. Missionary endeavor has traditionally been bilateral. A strong church sends workers and funds into a non-Christian area and brings a young church into being. Personal and financial help continues to be supplied the younger church by the parent body. The relation always involves some degree of dependence.

Multi-lateral missions, or inter-church aid, is very different. All participating churches, young and old, sending and receiving (in differing ways and differing degrees), sit around one table and face each other on the same level. Points of need are pinpointed, and a strategy for meeting them worked out in common. The resources of the whole group of churches are placed at the disposal of the whole, for the strengthening of the one world-wide spiritual community. Missions thus become not just a two-way street, but a multi-level, multi-lane highway-exchange, with traffic of many kinds passing in various directions. Considerations of comparative dignity and power tend to disappear. In the process younger churches and their leaders discover and exert their full powers. They are fitted for the responsibilities of independence and, if the worst befalls, for isolation.

Second, there is an effort to upgrade theological education. The International Missionary Council is undertaking a project of multi-million dollar dimensions in this field. An ecumenical Theological Education Committee is being set up and provided with adequate funds. It will select key union institutions and build them up to full strength. At the same time it will make a major effort in the translation and publication of theological texts for differing language areas, and the improvement of libraries in existing seminaries. In this well-conceived program the American Board is preparing to invest substantial resources. At the same time, we are continuing to strengthen schools and programs for which we have particular responsibility.

Third, the younger churches and mission boards are recognizing that in substantial measure leadership for the Christian enterprise must come not from professional religious workers but from lay people equipped and willing to serve the church in its total mission. Our conventional pattern of at least one full-time salaried religious leader in every parish is out of the question for congregations in India or Africa which simply do not have the resources to support such leadership. But on the staffs of Christian schools and hospitals, and in a wide range of other vocations, there are lay people who can provide effective voluntary leadership on the local level and throughout the structure of the church.

For example, Bishop Newbigin and our missionaries in South India have for some time been developing classes for village lay men and women. About 100 men have already been given a license to conduct services and preach, and they serve over 200 small congregations. Some will ultimately be ordained as volunteer pastors. Other countries are developing similar programs.

And what about the missionary from abroad? Will the development of native leadership make him surplus baggage? Everything points to precisely the opposite conclusion. His role may be modified, his responsibilities change. He may have to adjust to different standards of living and ways of working. But an essential and exciting job will remain for him.

Dr. Hale Cook of our Vadala station in West India tells part of the story: "The Congregational Church in the USA has a relatively highly educated constituency of nearly 1.5 million. From this number in

(*Continued on page 35*)

A revived study of Edwards is in order.

JONATHAN EDWARDS IN 1958

by CHARLES T. BROWN*

THE NAME OF JONATHAN EDWARDS lives with considerable influence and prestige in 1958 as it did in the year of his death 1758. A year ago the last church which he served before going to Princeton, the First Congregational Church of Stockbridge, Massachusetts, dedicated its remodeled assembly room in his honor. This, although a very fitting gesture, is not significant enough a memorial to pay homage to a famous cleric of the stature of Edwards in American theology and letters. A revived study of his thinking and beliefs is in order on this bicentennial of his death.

As you attempt to wend your way through his writings you soon grow weary of his style which constantly reverts to scriptural reference to support his points. Yet, we understand that this use of the Scriptures was for him, and his day, doctrinely sound and unquestionably acceptable intellectually.

He went to Stockbridge to fill the vacancy in that Indian Mission caused by the death of the first pastor, John Sergeant. His task was to preach to the Berkshire Aborigines a simple, profound message of Christian salvation. Times were changing in the Hills during the last half of the Eighteenth Century, however, and the Indians were getting fewer and more hostile. Although there were white people to minister to, the missionary had unexpected time for thought and writing. This meant that there was time for Jonathan Edwards to formulate his philosophical and theological thoughts and to establish by his treatises the faith of John Calvin permanently in American theological thought. All of this in spite of the fact that, it is said many of his great works were written in his home at Stockbridge under constant danger of Indian massacre. The report is that the danger of such was so real that his daughter refused to remain in the town.

It was, nevertheless, the opportunity which life in this frontier village of the Berkshires offered for six years of his life that drew from the heart, soul and mind of Edwards his greatest contributions. In this setting came to fruition his profound deliberations upon *Freedom of the Will, Original Sin* and other well known works which provide an indelible expression of his consistently advocated belief in the eternal and righteous judgment upon the acts of the individual by Almighty God.

We can scarcely imagine what he would say today to strengthen his burning concept of sin in the presence of a contemporary culture where worldliness and evil become daily practice in the lives of too many men and women in society, politics and business. What would Edwards say to emphasize the eternal, righteous judgment of God upon the individual who wilfully is disobedient to the spiritual and moral laws of Christian teaching and practice? Surely, he would have a virile theology and message of repentance and redemption.

Jonathan Edwards, one of America's great Congregationalists, has and still receives various degrees of esteem and rejection from Christian leaders. It is said

*The writer is Minister of Elm Street Congregational Church, Bucksport, Maine.

that the well-known preacher of Boston, George A. Gordon, fell into the class of those who could see no good in Edwards. His evaluation of him is typically severe. "No single treatise of Edwards can to-day commend itself to a free and informed mind. In his *Freedom of the Will, the Religious Affections, the Nature of Virtue, God's Final End in Creation,* the Christian Church can not follow him as a whole and those who insist upon all or none, do their best to make it none."

Many would say that Edwards forgets man in his deep concern for God and his judgment. Yet, may it not be true that somewhere between the God as conceived by this preacher two hundred years ago and the ultra man-centered materialism of statistically-minded 20th Century Christianity is the golden mean of religious redemption and grace as taught by Jesus Christ?

MISSION FIELDS—*Continued from page 33*

the last 10 years we have had three short-term missionaries for this area. The church in our area numbers not more than 20,000, of whom only a small per cent have as much as grade school education, or regular contact with adequate religious leadership. The amazing thing is that we have as many fine leaders as we do. But I hope you will stress what all the thoughtful Indian Christians of my acquaintance regularly repeat, 'India needs more missionaries, not fewer.' " It is not native leadership *or* missionaries, but *both-and,* where leadership of all kinds is desperately short.

Moreover, the missionary will always be needed as a living symbol of the supra-national and supra-racial character of the Christian church. Without the interchange of life and thought which he represents and embodies, it is desperately easy for a young church which is a minority group in a fiercely nationalistic environment to lose the sense of belonging to a universal community.

And finally, he helps the churches here and abroad keep alive the sense of mission. They settle into the routine of parish and synod activities, the round of worship and meetings and conferences. They get into a rut of self-service and self-concern and forget what the church is: a task force for God's enlarging sovereignty in the whole world. A real missionary is a tangible, inescapable and embarrassingly lively bit of mission in the flesh. That is why he will continue to be needed in India, China, Angola and America.

RECOMMENDED READING

A list and commentary prepared by The Associates in Reading of the Department of the Ministry, Congregational Christian Churches.

It was the first meeting in a number of years of the Associates In Reading without Tertius van Dyke. A contemporary classical scholar defines a classicist as "one who is concerned with the whole story of man's life." This may be why the beloved former Dean of Hartford Seminary urged us so often to read the classics, particularly Greek drama. Tertius van Dyke's own life was that rare combination of the man for whom books were not tools, but, like trout streams, parishioners, theological students, family and friends, were part of living. Those coming under his ministry might well say what Peter Parson says in a book on our list:

"The Church was my University. It was from the pulpit that there sounded forth the notes of great literature. . . It was from my minister's lips that I first heard the names of Keats, Browning, Shelley, Wordsworth and Tennyson. From him, and not from my school masters . . . . not in the inky fingered atmosphere of the examination room, but in church, where men and women of all ages gathered to confront the issues of life, poetry served as an illumination of that dark, groping, sin-stained and heroic life that we all shared."

A member of our committee who hears the preaching of many of us, urges a greater use of dictionaries and grammars. Such a volume similar to Fowler's "English Usage" is Evans' "A Dictionary of Contemporary American Usage." (Random House, $5.95) Don't try it if you want to spare your favorite cliches.

Your committee would like to know how many Associates in Reading groups there are in our fellowship. Let us hear from you.

Nathanael Guptill, in the second week of his new duties as Associate Minister and Secretary of the General Council, was present for our meeting at Congregational House, Hartford, April 28-29.

Arthur E. Wilson

Primary List

The Puritan Dilemma by Edmund F. Morgan, Little, Brown & Co., $3.50.

If the spirit of "an institution is but the length and shadow of a man" this book lucidly describes the Puritan tradition through the life of John Winthrop. The author, Professor of History at Yale University, begins with Winthrop's boyhood in rural England at the end of the 16th century. At the end of his life in 1649, John Winthrop had lived to see the Puritan colony in the new world an established fact with the dimensions of our heritage largely defined.

The Puritan Dilemma is essentially a three-sided one. Man finds himself individually struggling for righteousness against a sinfulness from which he

can never wholly escape. He must also decide the extent of compromise he can make with a society he believes to be wrong. Still further, there is the question—as in the case of Roger Williams—of how much rebellion may be allowed within the ranks of the rebels. Puritanism never lacked tension and not often did they lack courage.

This reviewer would add two observations. A reading of this book will leave one with an admiration for the Puritans, though there is no attempt to gloss over infirmities of the flesh, and will do much to allay the disrepute into which Puritanism has fallen. Second, when an irreconcilable situation arises, separation rather than disruptive and destructive tactics are more in keeping with our tradition.

An Introduction to The Apocrypha by Bruce Metzger, Oxford Press, $4.00.

Professor Bruce Metzger of Princeton has here provided a splendid introduction to the Apocrypha at a time when the Revised Standard Version has just become available. Such a book will meet a real need, for it must be confessed that most Protestant Christians know altogether too little about the apocryphal literature that is just outside the canon. Yet a greater understanding of this literature will throw helpful light on the Bible itself.

Moreover, study of the Apocrypha will be rewarding for its own sake. Professor Metzger is the product of sound scholarship and sensitive insight. The author traces the history of the influence of the Apocrypha on the New Testament and on the later thinking of the church. Of subordinate interest is the book's appendix on the New Testament Apocrypha.

No minister's library can be described as complete without a copy of the Apocrypha in the RSV edition. It should be accompanied by such a brief introduction as Professor Metzger has provided.

The Christian Tradition and The Unity We Seek by Albert C. Outler, Oxford, $3.25.

This timely study of the ecumenical movement by one of its most able proponents is, in the words of the author, "a track for the times." Dr. Outler, Professor of Theology at Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, is concerned with some of the problems and prospects of Christian unity and stresses the unity and continuity of the Christian tradition. Even though we are separated Christians, he declares that we have a common history and are joint heirs with Jesus Christ and members of his body, the church.

The need for Christian unity grows more acute, yet in some respects the movement toward unity has lost its momentum. Unless there is a reinvigoration Professor Outler declares that "the movement will falter in its forward motion and a supremely significant 'fullness of time' will pass unransomed."

Dr. Outler makes a distinction between "ecumenical *atmosphere*" and an "ecumenical *blueprint*", between the "posture of faith and its conceptual outworking." The doctrinal tasks of the ecumenical movement must be considered in the right order of "Christ—Event, Christian community, and

Christian doctrine." (Page 147). We must realize the significance of *what we already have in common* before we proceed to *fullness* of unity.

To all who are concerned with the cause of Christian unity, (and this should include each of us), this book is heartily commended.

Christ and The Christian by Nels F. S. Ferre, Harper, 1958, $3.75, pp. 253.

The sixth volume in Ferre's systematic theology is perhaps his best to date. The style is good and the arguments are concise. Of course, Ferre the theological writer is never easy, possibly because he combines the systematic and evangelical in ways which are striking but sometimes confusing.

His first chapter, on the starting point, will help many ministers. He argues that we cannot understand Christ simply through our individual experience, nor through the historical development of creeds about Him, nor even through the Biblical accounts alone. Ferre's starting point is "Jesus Christ as Agape, the Event-Meaning that most fully explains our experience and our world, most severely reveals and judges our sins and our failures, and most fully offers final salvation" (p. 54).

With this principle of interpretation Ferre undertakes to give meaning to Christ and humanity in terms of the old and the new in theology. One interesting—and debatable—correlation is between the two-nature theory of Christ and a modern interpretation reminiscent of Kahler and Forsyth.

This book is a challenging one whose arguments may puzzle many and disturb others; but none will feel that he can ignore them.

Secondary List

The Diary of Peter Parson by W. B. J. Martin, Abingdon Press, $2.75.

The most delightful book we have found in a long time to renew the glow of the ministerial calling. The author is a British Congregationalist who writes regularly for the British Weekly. (See quotation in Chairman's foreword.)

The Doctrine of The Trinity by Cyril C. Richardson, Abingdon Press, $3.00.

Using the insights of the Professor of early church history, Dr. Richardson of Union uses a fresh and welcome approach to examine this fundamental Christian doctrine. Without being iconoclastic, he finds the doctrine as commonly understood, to be inadequate for the presentation of the New Testament concept. Its "threeness" is an artificial construct which must be used as a gauge to an indefinite number of terms to convey the truths of the Christian gospel. An excellent book for lively parsonic discussion.

Relentless Strangers by Edward W. Warner, Muhlenberg Press, $2.50.

Here are brief but penetrating insights into the lives of ten persons, strangers, in the Bible. They probe into the innermost feelings in a rather

unique style, giving flashes of understanding that leave the reader in a reflective, wondering mood. Here is a glimpse of Jeremiah's understanding of love. Here is John the Baptist's contrast of himself and Jesus. Here Judas analyzes his own weakness. Here is a book you will pick up again and again.

Resurrection—An Historical Reason by Richard Niebuhr, Scribners.

This is a formidable analysis of the modern problem of theological method applied to one crucial doctrine, that of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Mr. Niebuhr analyzes the contributions of Strauss, Hermann, and Harnack and of Bultmann, Barth and John Knox. He points to the disjunction of faith from history and nature in post-Kantian theology, and contends that we are in need of a method which will bring them together again. Accordingly, the accounts of the empty tomb assume a great new importance.

Principles of Christian Worship by Raymond Abba, Oxford.

Mr. Abba has produced a volume which successfully bridges the gap between theology and practice in liturgical matters, an achievement notable for its absence in most works of a similar character. A Congregationalist, he takes his stand with reformed theology, expounds it in relation to his theme, gives a brief history of worship and concludes with succinct analyses of preaching and of the sacraments. It is an outstanding book in its field.

Faith for Personal Crises by Carl Michalson, Scribners, $3.50.

This volume, dealing with experiences which occur in every human life, is a most welcome addition to the writing in this field. It deals simply, yet profoundly, with seven crises common to all men. There is a first chapter, "A Theology for Crucial Situations" which sets the tone for the thesis, well defined and developed, which indicates that the Christian faith has adequate answers for the deepest human needs.

The Spirit of American Christianity by Ronald E. Osborne, Harper & Bros., $3.75.

This is an excellent book for Congregationalists, especially of New England, to read. While it covers much ground, at the same time it digs deep, bringing up to the surface much that is either unknown or unappreciated. The first chapters telling the racy stories of church expansion are anything but superficial. The closing chapter, which is sympathetic, yet honestly critical, raises many haunting questions which must be answered. The bibliographical notes are invaluable.

The Scrolls and The New Testament by Krister Stendahl, editor, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1957, $4.00.

Here is a book which has been eagerly awaited by all who have been concerned over the effect of the Qumran discoveries on New Testament criticism and interpretation and more particularly on the date, authorship and ideology of the Fourth Gospel.

Krister Stendahl, Associate Professor of New Testament at Harvard University, editor, has brought together eleven competent scholars, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, to share the present verdict of mature and original scholarship on the significance of the "words, concepts, features and attitudes found in both the Scrolls and the New Testament."

The contributors to this volume compose an impressive list. Among them are Bo Reicke, Professor of New Testament, University of Basle; Kurt Schubert, Professor of Judaic Studies, University of Vienna; Ernest Vogt, S. J., Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome: Oscar Cullmann of the Protestant Theological Faculty, Paris; and W. H. Brownlee, Professor of Old Testament, Duke University.

* * * * * *

THE COMMITTEE OF ASSOCIATES IN READING

ARTHUR E. WILSON, *Chairman*
300 Weybosset St., Providence 3, R. I.

W. HARPER WELCH, *Secretary*
4 Loomis Street, Montpelier, Vermont

William L. Bradley, Hartford, Conn.
Richard P. Carter, Suffield, Conn.
Chalmers Coe, Hartford, Conn.
James F. English, Hartford, Conn.
Rolland G. Ewing, Torrington, Conn.
Donald H. Finley, Binghamton, N. Y.
Johnson A. Haines, Dover-Foxcroft, Me.
Deane L. Hodges, Plymouth, N. H.
Albert J. Penner, Boston, Mass.
Clifford O. Simpson, Manchester, Conn.
Richard L. Snyder, Westport, Conn.
Ronald J. Tamblyn, South Hadley, Mass.
David E. Weinland, Springfield, Mass.
Nathanael M. Guptill, New York, N. Y.
(ex officio)
William C. Hart, Pittsfield, Mass.